arXiv:1611.10027v1 [math-ph] 30 Nov 2016

ARITHMETIC SPECTRAL TRANSITIONS FOR THE MARYLAND MODEL

SVETLANA JITOMIRSKAYA AND WENCAI LIU

ABSTRACT. We give a precise description of spectra of the Maryland model $(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}u)_n = u_{n+1} + u_{n-1} + \lambda \tan \pi(\theta + n\alpha)u_n$ for all values of parameters.

We introduce an arithmetically defined index $\delta(\alpha, \theta)$ and show that for $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$, $\sigma_{sc}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \overline{\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}}$ and $\sigma_{pp}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) \geq \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. Since $\sigma_{ac}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \emptyset$, this gives complete description of the spectral decomposition for *all* values of parameters λ, α, θ, making it the first case of a family where arithmetic spectral transition is described without any parameter exclusion. The set of eigenvalues can be explicitly identified for all parameters, using the *quantization condition*. We also establish, for the first time for this or any other model, a quantization condition for singular continuous spectrum (an arithmetically defined measure zero set that supports singular continuous measures) for all parameters.

1. Introduction

The Maryland model is a discrete self-adjoint Schrödinger operator on $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ of the form

$$(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}u)_n = u_{n+1} + u_{n-1} + \lambda \tan \pi(\theta + n\alpha)u_n. \tag{1}$$

We will refer to λ as coupling, α as frequency, and θ as the phase. For simplicity, we will sometimes omit the dependence on parameters λ, α and θ in notations.

This operator was proposed by Grempel, Fishman, and Prange in 1982 [19] as a model stemming from the study of quantum chaos. They exactly computed its integrated density of states and obtained, in an essentially rigorous way, a dense set of explicitly determined eigenvalues, corresponding to exponentially decaying eigenfunctions, for Diophantine frequencies. Even though artificial, it became quite popular in Physics as an exactly solvable example of the family of incommensurate models, e.g. [8, 15], with spectral transitions governed by arithmetics. It was recently identified as the topological quantum phase transition point of a certain family [16]. Mathematically, it is interesting due to its richness of spectral theory, abundance of unusual features, yet amenability to analysis that often has a tendency to become relevant to other potentials as well. It was dubbed the Maryland model by B. Simon [12, 26] who cited the original work [19] as a textbook example of dealing with small divisors. Maryland model is the subject of Sec. 10.3 in [12] and Ch. 18 in [24].

When $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$, operator h is periodic, so has purely absolutely continuous spectrum for all θ. On the other hand, for $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ it has unbounded potential, thus no absolutely continuous spectrum for all θ [27]. As typical for quasiperiodic-type potentials it undergoes a transition from Anderson localization (pure point spectrum with exponentially decaying eigenfunctions) to singular-continuous spectrum as α changes from Diophantine to Liouville. Both Diophantine (for all θ) and Liouville (for a.e. θ) parts of the above sentence were established in [14, 26], by different methods, thus solving the problem of determining the spectral type for a.e. α, θ. The intermediate regime of α was studied for a.e. θ, and the location of a.e. θ transition in α was conjectured already in [26], but the regime of the neighborhood of the transition remained open. Note that typically, in families with transitions, neighborhood of the transition both

represents the most challenge and is of the most interest. Also the location (or existence) of the transition in θ was not even conjectured previously. In this paper we determine the spectral types for all α, θ, thus also precisely describing the associated arithmetical metal-insulator transitions. As far as we know, this is the first time spectral properties of a quasiperiodic operator are described for *all* parameters in a situation with arithmetic spectral transitions.

We will assume $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$ (otherwise the spectrum is purely absolutely continuous), $\lambda > 0$ (otherwise use $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = h_{-\lambda,-\alpha,-\theta}$) and $\theta \notin 1/2 + \alpha\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}$ (so the potential is well defined). In the rest of the paper we will often use "all $\lambda(\alpha, \theta)$", meaning "all $\lambda(\alpha, \theta)$ as above".

Let $\frac{p_n}{q_n}$ be the continued fraction approximants to α. Define an index $\delta(\alpha, \theta) \in [-\infty, \infty]$,

$$\delta(\alpha,\theta) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln ||q_n(\theta - 1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} + \ln q_{n+1}}{q_n}, \tag{2}$$

where $||x||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = \min_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}} |x - \ell|$. Let $\gamma_\lambda(e)$ be the Lyapunov exponent (see (4) (7)) , and $k_\lambda(e)$ the IDS of the Maryland model (see (5)). Let $\sigma_{pp}(h)$, $\sigma_{sc}(h)$ and $\sigma_{ac}(h)$ be the pure point spectrum, sc spectrum, and ac spectrum of h, respectively. Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *For all α, λ, θ, we have*

(1) $\sigma_{sc}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \overline{\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}}$
(2) $\sigma_{pp}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) \geq \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$
(3) $\sigma_{ac}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \emptyset$.



Fig.1



Fig.2



Fig.3

Remark 1.2. (3) is of course listed for completeness only, as it follows directly from [27].

Remark 1.3. This gives the following more precise description:

case 1: If $\delta(\alpha,\theta) = +\infty$, then Theorem 1.1 implies h has purely singular continuous spectrum with $\sigma_{sc}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = (-\infty,\infty)$.

case 2: If $\gamma_\lambda(0) < \delta(\alpha,\theta) < +\infty$ (see Fig.1), it is clear that $\overline{\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}} = \{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) \leq \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. Then

$$\sigma_{sc}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) \leq \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$$

and

$$\sigma_{pp}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = \{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) \geq \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}.$$

case 3: If $\delta(\alpha,\theta) \leq \gamma_\lambda(0)$ (see Fig.2 and Fig.3), it is clear that $\overline{\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}} = \emptyset$. Then h has pure point spectrum with $\sigma_{pp}(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = (-\infty,\infty)$.

Remark 1.4. For Diophantine α and any θ, $\delta(\alpha,\theta) = 0$, thus we are always in case 3. For Liouville α and a.e. θ, $\delta(\alpha,\theta) = \infty$, so we are in case 1. However, for every α, no matter how Liouville, there exists a dense set of θ as in Case 3, so with pure point spectrum; see Corollary 4.2.

The more precise history of this question is the following. The results of [19] were made rigorous, by different methods, in [14, 26] thus proving the Diophantine and Liouville (a.e. θ) version of Theorem 1.1. Moreover, the analysis of Simon [26] went deeper in the arithmetics of α. Let us define an index $\beta(\alpha) \in [0,\infty]$ by

$$\beta(\alpha) = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n}. \tag{3}$$

Note that for Diophantine α, $\beta(\alpha) = 0$, and for Liouville, $\beta(\alpha) = \infty$. Simon showed that for a.e. θ, h has purely dense point spectrum on $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \beta(\alpha)\}$ and purely singular continuous spectrum on $\{e : \tilde{\gamma}_\lambda(e) < \frac{1}{2}\beta(\alpha)\}$, for a certain $\tilde{\gamma}_\lambda(e) > \gamma_\lambda(e)$. The latter was improved to $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \frac{1}{2}\beta(\alpha)\}$ in [24]. Therefore those results left open the neighborhood of the transition: $\{e : \beta(\alpha) \geq \gamma_\lambda(e) \geq \frac{1}{2}\beta(\alpha)\}$ and are only at the measure-theoretic level in θ's.[1]

There have been a number of interesting studies of a multidimensional generalization of Maryland model (already in [9, 14, 26]) and other related models, for example, surface Maryland model (e.g. [20]). Certain other interesting aspects of the classical Maryland model were also explored, e.g. [13]. However, the state of the art of the question of spectral decomposition remained as described above.

In general, having Diophantine and Liouvillean approaches meet at the transition (or non-transition) is known to be a delicate task. It has been recently achieved in several notable quasiperiodic problems [2, 6]. Here we see our main accomplishment however in obtaining the result for *all* θ and precisely describing the corresponding transition.

Our next result is concerned with the *quantization condition*: the explicit description of the support of the spectral measure of h. The Maryland model is often called exactly solvable.

[1] It should be noted that while one can extract an explicit condition on the removed sets of θ in [26], it is intrinsically not possible within the argument of Pastur-Figotin [14, 24].

Indeed, Fishman, Grempel, and Prange computed explicitly the Lyapunov exponent $\gamma_\lambda(e) > 0$ as satisfying

$$4\cosh\gamma_\lambda(e) = \sqrt{(2+e)^2+\lambda^2} + \sqrt{(2-e)^2+\lambda^2}, \tag{4}$$

and the integrated density of states $k_\lambda(e)$ (IDS) (see [7] for the definition of IDS) as

$$k_\lambda(e) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi}\arctan(\ e/|\lambda|\tanh\gamma_\lambda(e)). \tag{5}$$

(for all λ, α)[2] and presented an explicit dense countable set of e that are eigenvalues of $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ with Diophantine α : energies e such that

$$k_\lambda(e) \in \theta - 1/2 + \alpha\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}. \tag{6}$$

This was made rigorous in [14, 26] (in particular, the completeness of corresponding eigenfunctions was shown) and Simon dubbed (6) the *quantization condition* and extended it to the regime $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \beta(\alpha)\}$. Thus in this regime the supports of all spectral measures can be explicitly described through (5),(6). Simon then posed a question of finding a quantization condition (thus precise arithmetic description) for supports of singular continuous spectral measures. Here we solve a certain version of it. To formulate this more precisely, let $\mu_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = \frac{1}{2}(\mu^{\delta_{-1}}_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} + \mu^{\delta_0}_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta})$, where $\mu^{\delta_i}_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ is the spectral measure of operator $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ with respect to vector δ_i, $i = -1, 0$ (δ_i is the Dirac mass at $i \in \mathbb{Z}$). A set A is a support of a singular measure μ if $|A| = \mu(A^c) = 0$, where $|\cdot|$ stands for Lebesgue measure. While for a point measure it is natural to identify its support as the collection of point masses, for singular continuous measure it is only well defined up to sets of Lebesgue and μ measure zero.

Now, let

$$A_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = \{e : ||q_n(k_\lambda(e) - \theta - 1/2)|| \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty\}.$$

Also let

$$Q_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = \{e : k_\lambda(e) \in \theta - 1/2 + \alpha\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

As $k_\lambda(e)$ is continuous and strictly monotone, $Q_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ is a countable dense subset of $\mathbb{R}$, and $A_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ is dense in $\mathbb{R}$. Also, $|\{a \in [0,1] : ||q_n(a-\theta-1/2)|| < \epsilon\}| < 2\epsilon$, so we have that $|\{a \in [0,1] : ||q_n(a-\theta-1/2)|| \to 0\}| = 0$ and thus $|A_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}| = 0$ by the fact $\frac{dk_\lambda(e)}{de} > 0$.

Let $\sigma_p(h)$ be the collection of all eigenvalues of h. We have

Theorem 1.5. *For all λ, α, θ as above*

1. *$\mu_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ is supported on $A_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$,*
2. *the set of eigenvalues with corresponding eigenfunctions decaying exponentially coincides with the set $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\} \cap Q_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$,*
3. *$\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\} \cap Q_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} \subseteq \sigma_p(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) \subseteq \{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) \geq \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$.*

Remark 1.6. Thus $\sigma_p(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta})$ may differ from $\{\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\} \cap Q_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}\}$ only by a subset of $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) = \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. Note that $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) = \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ consists of at most two points, see Fig. 1-3.

Theorem 1.5 therefore extends the quantization condition for point spectrum to the entire region $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ which is the entire set where point spectrum can possibly be located up to at most two points, and establishes a version of the quantization condition for supports of singular continuous measures: an arithmetically defined measure zero set that supports $\mu_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$. To the best of our knowledge, the latter is the first such arithmetic condition

[2]It may be interesting to think of the corresponding cocycle as monotonic. Even though, due to the discontinuity the theorems of [5] do not apply, some of the conclusions still hold.

for supports of singular conrinuous spectra, for any model[3]. We believe that the methods of this work could lead to obtaining information on supports of singular continuous spectral measures for many other quasiperiodic operators that in turn may allow dimensional analysis that is not intrinsically one-dimensional.

Of course, since supports are defined up to μ- measure zero sets, this could ostensibly be improved by finding smaller sets that have the same properties. Indeed, we in fact prove a stronger version of part 1, finding arithmetically defined $B_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ that are proper subsets of $A_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ and support $\mu_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$. We formulate part 1 the way we do (rather than a stronger statement that we prove) purely for aesthetic purposes.

A well known support of $\mu_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ is $C_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} := \{e : \text{such that there exists a polynomially bounded solution to } h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}u = eu\}$. To find an arithmetic description of $C_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ remains an interesting open problem.

Finally, because of this aspect even after Theorem 1.5 and absence of eigenvalues in $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ is established, case (1) of Theorem 1.1 does not follow because it is not clear that supports of singular continuous spectral measures *have to be* dense in $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. Indeed, the fact that $\text{spec}(h) = \{e : k_\lambda(e+\varepsilon) - k_\lambda(e-\varepsilon) > 0 \text{ for any } \varepsilon > 0\}$ and (5) only imply that the spectrum of Maryland model $\sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta})$ is $(-\infty,\infty)$ for almost every phase θ [12]. For bounded potentials with some continuity it is easy to extend such result to *all* θ. Moreover, the fact that $\sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) \supseteq \{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) \geq \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ for all θ follows from the denseness of $Q_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$. However, in the singular continuous regime, denseness of $A_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ does not automatically yield the result. Still

Theorem 1.7. *We have $\sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = (-\infty,\infty)$ for all phases θ.*

The strategy in our proof of the main result is overall following that in Simon [26], but we present novel ideas in both localization and singular continuous parts.

From the localization side, our main contribution consists in a certain new technique in handling the cohomological equation in the regime of very small denominators: $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \beta(\alpha)\}$.

From the singular continuous side, we develop a version of Gordon-type argument allowing to handle singular potentials in a sharp way. While in the interests of brevity we present here an argument taylored to the Maryland model, it is actually quite robust, and can be easily modified to obtain similar results for a large class of quasiperiodic-type models. Moreover, we believe our method has an even wider applicability.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows:

In §2, we present a Gordon-type method for cocycles with singularities and use it to prove that $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum on $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. In §3, we show that $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has only pure point spectrum on $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. In §4, we prove that $\sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}) = (-\infty,\infty)$ for all parameters, proving Theorem 1.7 and Theorem 1.1. We also show that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$, there exist phases with pure point spectrum. In §5, we turn to another aspect and compute the complexified Lyapunov exponent using Avila's technique [1]. Besides being a new (and very simple) computation of $\gamma_\lambda(e)$, it gives another example of how regularity can coexist with positive Lyapunov exponent on the spectrum of an operator with singular potential.

[3]While an arithmetic condition for supports of singular continuous spectra appearing for Diophantine α and exceptional phases for the almost Mathieu operators can be extracted from the proof in [3], it does not currently cover all parameters

2. Singular continuous spectrum

In this section, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\delta(\alpha,\theta)$ be as in (2), then $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum on $\{e:\gamma_\lambda(e)<\delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. In particular, for almost every phase θ (only depends on α, not on λ or e), h has purely singular continuous spectrum on $\{e:\gamma_\lambda(e)<\beta(\alpha)\}$.*

We may assume $\delta(\alpha,\theta)>0$, otherwise the set $\{e:\gamma_\lambda(e)<\delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ is empty. If $\delta(\alpha,\theta)=\infty$, select δ to be any finite number bigger than $\gamma_\lambda(e)$. Before giving the proof of Theorem 2.1, some preliminaries are necessary.

The one-step transfer-matrix of $hu=eu$ is given by

$$A(\theta)=\begin{pmatrix} e-\lambda\tan\pi\theta & -1\\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}.$$

So that $A(\theta+n\alpha)\begin{pmatrix} u_n\\ u_{n-1}\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix} u_{n+1}\\ u_n\end{pmatrix}$. We will refer to the pair (α,A) as Maryland cocycle understood as a linear skew-product $(\theta,w)\mapsto(\theta+\alpha,A(\theta)\cdot w)$, $\theta\in\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z},\theta\notin 1/2+\alpha\mathbb{Z}+\mathbb{Z}$, $w\in\mathbb{R}^2$. In general, for an invertible cocycle (α,B) we define B_n by $(\alpha,B)^n=(n\alpha,B_n)\,n\in\mathbb{Z}$ so that for $n\geq 0$,

$$B_n(\theta)=B(\theta+(n-1)\alpha)B(\theta+(n-2)\alpha)\cdots B(\theta),$$

and $B_{-n}(\theta)=B_n(\theta-n\alpha)^{-1}$.

Given a cocycle (α,B), the Lyapunov exponent (LE) $L(\alpha,B)$ is defined by the following formula,

$$L(\alpha,B)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\int_{\mathbb{T}}\ln\|B_n(\theta)\|d\theta, \tag{7}$$

Denote $\gamma_\lambda(e)=L(\alpha,A)$ (see Theorem 5.3).

Because $\tan\pi\theta$ is singular at $\theta=\frac{1}{2}\mod\mathbb{Z}$, we will rewrite the Maryland cocycle as

$$\begin{pmatrix} e-\lambda\tan\pi\theta & -1\\ 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}=\frac{1}{\cos\pi\theta}\begin{pmatrix} e\cos\pi\theta-\lambda\sin\pi\theta & -\cos\pi\theta\\ \cos\pi\theta & 0\end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$D(\theta)=\begin{pmatrix} e\cos\pi\theta-\lambda\sin\pi\theta & -\cos\pi\theta\\ \cos\pi\theta & 0\end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

we have

$$L(\alpha,A)=L(\alpha,D)-\int_{\mathbb{T}}\ln|\cos\pi\theta|d\theta. \tag{9}$$

Notice that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}}\ln|\cos\pi\theta|d\theta=-\ln 2. \tag{10}$$

Thus $D(\theta)$ is the regular part and $\frac{1}{\cos\pi\theta}$ is the singular part of the cocycle. We now give the estimate of the two parts separately. First, since $D(\theta)$ is analytic, we have that $\ln||D_n(\theta)||$ is a continuous subadditive cocycle, thus it is well known that, as a corollary of unique ergodicity,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\ln||D_n(\theta)||\leq L(\alpha,D), \tag{11}$$

uniformly in θ.

In order to estimate the singular part we will need

Lemma 2.2. *(Lemma 9.7, [2]) Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \le \ell_0 \le q_n - 1$ be such that $|\cos\pi(\theta+\ell_0\alpha)| = \inf_{0\le\ell\le q_n-1}|\cos\pi(\theta+\ell\alpha)|$, then for some absolute constant $C > 0$,*

$$-C\ln q_n \le \sum_{\ell=0,\ell\neq\ell_0}^{q_n-1} \ln|\cos\pi(\theta+\ell\alpha)| + (q_n-1)\ln 2 \le C\ln q_n.$$

We will also use that the denominators of continued fraction approximants of α satisfy

$$\|k\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ge ||q_n\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}, 1 \le k < q_{n+1}, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2q_{n+1}} \le \Delta_n \triangleq \|q_n\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \le \frac{1}{q_{n+1}}. \tag{13}$$

We are now ready to prove

Theorem 2.3. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a subsequence $\tilde{q}_k$ of q_n such that the following estimate holds*

$$\prod_{j=0}^{\tilde{q}_k-1}|c_j| \ge \frac{e^{(\delta(\alpha,\theta)-\ln 2-\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}, \tag{14}$$

where $c_j = \cos\pi(\theta+j\alpha)$.

Proof. By the definition of $\delta(\alpha,\theta)$ (2), for any small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a subsequence $\tilde{q}_k$ of q_n such that

$$||\tilde{q}_k(\theta-1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ge \frac{e^{(\delta-\varepsilon/8)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}. \tag{15}$$

This implies

$$\tilde{q}_{k+1} \ge e^{(\delta-\varepsilon/8)\tilde{q}_k}. \tag{16}$$

Let $|c_{j_0}|$ be the smallest one of $|c_j|, j = 0, 1, \cdots, \tilde{q}_k - 1$. By Lemma 2.2 one has

$$\prod_{j=0}^{\tilde{q}_k-1}|c_j| \ge |c_{j_0}|e^{-\tilde{q}_k(\ln 2+\varepsilon/4)}.$$

In order to prove (14), it suffices to prove that

$$|c_{j_0}| \ge \frac{e^{(\delta-\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}, \tag{17}$$

for k large enough.

If the estimate (17) does not hold, i.e., $|c_{j_0}| \le \frac{e^{(\delta-\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}$, for some $0 \le j_0 \le \tilde{q}_k - 1$, then

$$||\theta - 1/2 + j_0\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \frac{e^{(\delta-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}.$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} ||\tilde{q}_k(\theta-1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} &\le ||j_0\tilde{q}_k\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} + \frac{e^{(\delta-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}} \\ &\le \frac{\tilde{q}_k}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}} + \frac{e^{(\delta-\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}} \\ &\le \frac{e^{(\delta-\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}} \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds by (13). This contradicts (15).

□

After this preparatory work we can move to showing absence of point spectrum by a Gordon-type method. Next we always assume $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. The following simple Lemma has become the classics of the field.[4]

Lemma 2.4. *([12, 17, 26]) Let $B \in SL(2,\mathbb{R})$ and x be a unit vector in $\mathbb{C}^2$, then*

$$\max\{||B^2x||, ||Bx||, ||B^{-1}x||\} \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

It is usually used in conjunction with a perturbation estimate. We will use

Lemma 2.5. *([26]) Let $A^1, A^2, \cdots, A^n$ and $B^1, B^2, \cdots, B^n$ be 2×2 matrices with $||\prod_{m=0}^{\ell-1} A^{j+m}|| \leq Ce^{d\ell}$ for some constant C and d. Then*

$$||(A^n + B^n)\cdots(A^1 + B^1) - A^n \cdots A^1|| \leq Ce^{dn}(\prod_{j=1}^{n}(1 + Ce^{-d}||B^j||) - 1).$$

Classical method uses rational approximation to rule out the ℓ^2 solutions. Here we use the Diophantine properties of α directly to show the transfer matrix behaves like a periodic one. Our final preparation is

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose for any j either $\eta^j = 0$ or $||\eta^j|| \leq \frac{C}{c_j^2 \tilde{q}_{k+1}}$ and $|c_j| \geq \frac{1}{C\tilde{q}_k}$. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$, the following estimates hold if k is sufficiently large:*

$$||A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta) - \prod_{j=\tilde{q}_k-1}^{0}(A(\theta + j\alpha) + \eta^j)|| \leq Ce^{-(\delta(\alpha,\theta)-\gamma_\lambda(e)-\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}, \tag{18}$$

$$||A_{\tilde{q}_k}^{-1}(\theta) - \prod_{j=0}^{\tilde{q}_k-1}(A(\theta + j\alpha)^{-1} + \eta^j)|| \leq Ce^{-(\delta(\alpha,\theta)-\gamma_\lambda(e)-\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}, \tag{19}$$

Proof. We only prove (18) with the case $|c_j| \geq \frac{1}{C\tilde{q}_k}$ and $||\eta^j|| \leq \frac{C}{c_j^2\tilde{q}_{k+1}}$ for all j. For the other cases, the proof is similar. Below, C is a large constant and may depend on e, λ, α.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta) - \prod_{j=\tilde{q}_k-1}^{0}(A(\theta + j\alpha) + \eta^j) &= \prod_{j=\tilde{q}_k-1}^{0}(\frac{D^j}{c_j} + \eta^j) - \prod_{j=\tilde{q}_k-1}^{0}\frac{D^j}{c_j} \\ &= (\prod_{j=0}^{\tilde{q}_k-1}\frac{1}{c_j})(\prod_{j=\tilde{q}_k-1}^{0}(D^j + O(\frac{1}{c_j\tilde{q}_{k+1}})) - \prod_{j=\tilde{q}_k-1}^{0}D^j), \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $D^j = D(\theta + j\alpha)$.

Denote $L := L(\alpha, D)$. Applying Lemma 2.5 to (20), one has

$$\begin{aligned} ||A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) - A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)|| &\leq (\prod_{j=0}^{\tilde{q}_k-1}\frac{1}{|c_j|})e^{(L+\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}(\prod_{j=0}^{\tilde{q}_k-1}(1 + \frac{C}{|c_j|\tilde{q}_{k+1}}) - 1) \\ &\leq C\frac{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}{e^{(\delta-\ln 2-\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}e^{(L+\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}((1 + C\frac{\tilde{q}_k}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}})^{\tilde{q}_k} - 1) \\ &\leq Ce^{-(\delta(\alpha,\theta)-\gamma_\lambda(e)-4\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k} \end{aligned}$$

[4] see [18] for its history.

The first inequality holds by (11), the second holds by (14) and our assumption on the minimum of $|c_j|$, the third holds by (9), (10) and (16). □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. We start with the proof of the first part, i.e. that $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum on $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. We know $\sigma_{ac}(h) = \emptyset$ so assume h_θ has an ℓ^2 solution u_n. Without loss of generality, assume the vector $\begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ u_{-1} \end{pmatrix}$ is unit.

Let $\varphi(n) = \begin{pmatrix} u_n \\ u_{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$, then we have

$$\varphi(n) = A_n(\theta)\varphi(0), \tag{21}$$

and

$$\varphi(-n) = A_n^{-1}(\theta - n\alpha)\varphi(0). \tag{22}$$

For simplicity, denote $\varphi := \varphi(0)$. Applying Lemma 2.4, for any k, we have that either $||A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| \geq \frac{1}{4}$, or $||A^{-1}_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| \geq \frac{1}{4}$, or $||A^2_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| \geq \frac{1}{4}$.

Case 1: $||A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| \geq \frac{1}{4}$. Then $||\varphi(\tilde{q}_k)|| \geq \frac{1}{4}$ by (21).

Case 2: $||A^{-1}_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| \geq \frac{1}{4}$. Let $|c_{j_0}|$ be the smallest one of $|c_j|$, $j = 0, 1, \cdots, \tilde{q}_k - 1$. Then one has

$$|c_j| \geq \frac{1}{C\tilde{q}_k} \text{ for } j \neq j_0. \tag{23}$$

We now consider the difference between $A^{-1}_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi$ and $A^{-1}_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\varphi$.

Let

$$A^{-1}_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta) - A^{-1}_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) = M_1 + M_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 \;=\; & A^{-1}_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta) - A^{-1}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)A^{-1}(\theta + \alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\cdots A^{-1}(\theta + (j_0 - 1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) \\ & A^{-1}(\theta + j_0\alpha)A^{-1}(\theta + (j_0 + 1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\cdots A^{-1}(\theta + (\tilde{q}_k - 1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M_2 \;=\; & A^{-1}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)A^{-1}(\theta + \alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\cdots A^{-1}(\theta + (j_0 - 1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) \\ & \varepsilon_{j_0}A^{-1}(\theta + (j_0 + 1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\cdots A^{-1}(\theta + (\tilde{q}_k - 1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon_{j_0} = A^{-1}(\theta + j_0\alpha) - A^{-1}(\theta + j_0\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)$.

Let

$$\eta_j = \frac{D(\theta + j\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)}{\cos\pi(\theta + j\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)} - \frac{D(\theta + j\alpha)}{\cos\pi(\theta + j\alpha)},$$

where D is given by (8). It is easy to see that

$$||D(\theta + j\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) - D(\theta + j\alpha)|| \leq \frac{C}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}$$

and

$$|\cos\pi(\theta + j\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) - \cos\pi(\theta + j\alpha)| \leq \frac{C}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}},$$

for all $|j| \leq \tilde{q}_k$, since $||\tilde{q}_k\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{q}_{k+1}}$ by (13). Combining with (17), one has

$$||\eta_j|| = O(\frac{1}{c_j^2\tilde{q}_{k+1}}). \tag{24}$$

Thus one has

$$\varepsilon_{j_0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & O(\frac{1}{c_{j_0}^2 \tilde{q}_{k+1}}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 2.6 with $\eta_{j_0} = 0$ (using (19) and (24)), we have

$$||M_1\varphi|| \le Ce^{-(\delta(\alpha,\theta)-\gamma_\lambda(e)-\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}.$$

We will show that

$$||M_2\varphi|| \le \frac{1}{16}. \tag{25}$$

This would imply that for k large enough

$$||A_{\tilde{q}_k}^{-1}(\theta)\varphi - A_{\tilde{q}_k}^{-1}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\varphi|| \le \frac{1}{8}.$$

and therefore (using (22))

$$||\varphi(-\tilde{q}_k)|| = ||A_{\tilde{q}_k}^{-1}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\varphi|| \ge \frac{1}{8}.$$

Let us now prove (25). We have

$$M_2\varphi = A^{-1}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)A^{-1}(\theta + \alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\cdots A^{-1}(\theta + (j_0-1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\varepsilon_{j_0}\varphi(j_0 - \tilde{q}_k + 1),$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} u_{j_0-\tilde{q}_k} \\ u_{j_0-\tilde{q}_k-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & e - \lambda\tan\pi(\theta + j_0\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{j_0-\tilde{q}_k+1} \\ u_{j_0-\tilde{q}_k} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\{u_n\} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$, one has

$$(e - \lambda\tan\pi(\theta + j_0\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha))u_{j_0-\tilde{q}_k} = O(1). \tag{26}$$

Clearly,

$$||\varepsilon_{j_0}\varphi(j_0 - \tilde{q}_k + 1)|| = O(\frac{u_{j_0-\tilde{q}_k}}{|c_{j_0}^2|\tilde{q}_{k+1}}). \tag{27}$$

If c_{j_0} is small enough, i.e., $|c_{j_0}| \le \frac{1}{C}$, then we have

$$|c_{j_0}(e - \lambda\tan\pi(\theta + j_0\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha))| \ge \frac{1}{C}.$$

Combining with (26) and (27), one has

$$||\varepsilon_{j_0}\varphi(j_0 - \tilde{q}_k + 1)|| \le \frac{C}{|c_{j_0}|\tilde{q}_{k+1}}. \tag{28}$$

If $|c_{j_0}| \ge \frac{1}{C}$, then(27) also implies (28).

It is easy to see that (Appendix A.1)

$$||A^{-1}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)A^{-1}(\theta + \alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)\cdots A^{-1}(\theta + (j_0-1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)|| \le Ce^{\tilde{q}_k(\gamma_\lambda(e)+\varepsilon)}.$$

Thus by (17), one has

$$\begin{aligned} ||M_2\varphi|| &\le e^{\tilde{q}_k(\gamma_\lambda(e)+\varepsilon)}\frac{C}{|c_{j_0}|\tilde{q}_{k+1}} \\ &\le Ce^{-(\delta(\alpha,\theta)-\gamma_\lambda(e)-2\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k} \end{aligned}$$

This implies (25).

Case 3: if $||A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| < \frac{1}{4}$ and $||A^2_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| \geq \frac{1}{4}$, using (18) and similarly as in the proof of case 2, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} ||A_{2\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi - A^2_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| &= ||(A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta+\tilde{q}_k\alpha) - A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta))A_{\tilde{q}_k}(\theta)\varphi|| \\ &\leq Ce^{-(\delta(\alpha,\theta)-\gamma_\lambda(e)-\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k} \leq 1/8, \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $||\varphi(\tilde{q}_{2k})|| \geq \frac{1}{8}$.

Therefore, we have that, in either case, $\max\{\varphi(\tilde{q}_k), \varphi(\tilde{-q}_k), \varphi(\tilde{q}_{2k})\} \geq \frac{1}{8}$ which contradicts the fact $\{u_n\} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$.

Now we are in a position to prove the second part of Theorem 2.1. By the definition of $\beta(\alpha)$ (3), there exists a subsequence $\hat{q}_k$ of q_n such that,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\ln \hat{q}_{k+1}}{\hat{q}_k} = \beta(\alpha).$$

Thus in order to prove the second part, it suffices to prove that for almost every θ,

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{\ln ||\hat{q}_k(\theta - 1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{\hat{q}_k} > \gamma_\lambda(e) - \beta(\alpha).$$

Suppose for some θ,

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{\ln ||\hat{q}_k(\theta - 1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{\hat{q}_k} \leq \gamma_\lambda(e) - \beta(\alpha).$$

This implies $\beta(\theta - 1/2) \geq \beta(\alpha) - \gamma_\lambda(e) > 0$. Notice however that $\{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \beta(\theta - 1/2) > 0\}$ is a measure zero set. □

3. The pure point spectrum

We will first prove the following

Theorem 3.1. *With $\delta(\alpha,\theta)$ as in (2), $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has only pure point spectrum (and the corresponding eigenfunctions are exponentially decaying) on $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$.*

Following [26] we will use the special algebraic structure of the Maryland model. First, we use Cayley transform and Fourier transform to give another form of the eigenvalue problem.

Introduce two new operators,

$$B_1 = \lambda^{-1}(e - \Delta), B_2 = \text{mult. by } \tan\pi(\theta + n\alpha),$$

where $(\Delta u)_n = u_{n+1} + u_{n-1}$.

Let

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\{u_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} : |u_n| \leq C(1 + |n|^C) \text{ for some constant } C\}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *([12, 26]) If a vector $u \in \mathcal{P}$ ($u \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ or is exponentially decaying) satisfies $B_2u = B_1u$, then $c = (1 + iB_1)u \in \mathcal{P}$ ($c \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ or is exponentially decaying) and*

$$(1 - iB_2)(1 + iB_2)^{-1}c = (1 - iB_1))(1 + iB_1)^{-1}c. \tag{29}$$

The converse is also true. More precisely, if $c \in \mathcal{P}$ ($c \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ or is exponentially decaying) and satisfies (29), then the vector $u = (1 + iB_1)^{-1}c \in \mathcal{P}$ ($u \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ or is exponentially decaying) and $B_1u = B_2u$.

It is easy to see that operator $(1 - iB_2)(1 + iB_2)^{-1}$ (this is called Cayley transform of B_2) is multiplication by

$$e^{-2\pi i(n\alpha+\theta)}$$

and (29) becomes

$$\left(\frac{1-iB_1}{1+iB_1}c\right)_n = e^{-2\pi i(n\alpha+\theta)}c_n. \tag{30}$$

Define a Fourier Transform (in distributional sense) of a sequence $f_n \in \mathcal{P}$ by

$$\hat{f}(x) = \sum_n e^{-2\pi inx} f_n.$$

Then equation (30) becomes

$$q(x)\hat{c}(x) = e^{-2\pi i\theta}\hat{c}(x+\alpha), \tag{31}$$

where $q(x) = -\frac{2\cos 2\pi x - e - i\lambda}{2\cos 2\pi x - e + i\lambda}$.

Lemma 3.3. *([26]) Let $q(x) = e^{-2\pi i\zeta(x)}$ with $-1/2 < \zeta(x) < 1/2$, then*

$$\zeta(x) = \sum_n \zeta_n e^{-2\pi inx},$$

where

$$\zeta_0 = k_\lambda(e) - \frac{1}{2}, \tag{32}$$

$$\zeta_n = (-1)^n \frac{1}{n\pi} e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)|n|}\sin(\pi n k_\gamma(e)), n \neq 0, \tag{33}$$

where $k_\lambda(e)$ is the IDS.

First, assume e satisfies the *quantization condition* (Proposition 3.6). Let us show that e is an eigenvalue with exponentially decaying eigenfunction in the regime $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$.

Lemma 3.4. *If e satisfies $k_\lambda(e) \in \theta - 1/2 + \alpha\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}$ and $\gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)$, then e is an eigenvalue of operator $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ and the corresponding eigenfunction is exponentially decaying.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that under the condition of Lemma 3.4, the following equation

$$e^{-2\pi i\zeta(x)}\hat{c}(x) = e^{-2\pi i\theta}\hat{c}(x+\alpha), \tag{34}$$

has an analytic (on $\mathbb{T}$) solution. Indeed, if $\hat{c}(x)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{T}$, then one has

$$|c_n| \leq Ce^{-t|n|},$$

for some $t > 0$, where c_n is the Fourier coefficient of $\hat{c}(x)$. This implies $c \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is exponentially decaying. This also implies e is an eigenvalue and $u \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ is exponentially decaying by Lemma 3.2.

Assume $k_\lambda(e) = \theta - 1/2 + m\alpha$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. We will prove that equation (34) has an analytic solution of the form $\hat{c}(x) = e^{-2\pi i(mx+\psi(x))}$, where $\psi(x)$ is real analytic on $\mathbb{T}$. Substituting $\hat{c}(x) = e^{-2\pi i(mx+\psi(x))}$ into (34) and comparing the Fourier coefficients, one has

$$\psi_k = \frac{\zeta_k}{e^{-2\pi ik\alpha} - 1}, k \neq 0. \tag{35}$$

Thus in order to prove this lemma, we only need to prove that ψ_k is exponentially decaying.

By the definition of $\delta(\alpha,\theta)$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$||q_n(\theta - 1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \frac{e^{(\delta+\varepsilon)q_n}}{q_{n+1}}, \tag{36}$$

for n large enough. Below, we always suppose n is sufficient large.

Thus

$$||q_n k_\gamma(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \le \frac{e^{(\delta+\varepsilon)q_n}}{q_{n+1}} + |m|\ ||q_n\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}.$$

If $|k| = q_n$, by (33) one has

$$|\zeta_k| \le Ce^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)q_n}||q_n k_\gamma(e))||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_k| &\le C\frac{e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)q_n}||q_n k_\gamma(e))||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{||q_n\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}} \\ &\le Ce^{-(\gamma_\lambda(e)-\delta-\varepsilon)q_n} + C|m|e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)q_n}. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, $|\psi_k|$ is exponentially decaying because $\gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)$.

If $q_n < |k| < q_{n+1}$ and $|k| \ge 2\frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{\gamma_\lambda(e)}$, by (35) one has

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_k| &\le C\frac{e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)|k|}}{||q_n\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}} \\ &\le Ce^{-\frac{\gamma_\lambda(e)}{2}|k|}. \end{aligned}$$

If $q_n < |k| < q_{n+1}$ and $|k| \le 2\frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{\gamma_\lambda(e)}$, let $|k| = \ell q_n + k_0$ with $|\ell| \le 2\frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n\gamma_\lambda(e)}$ and $0 \le k_0 < q_n$. Assume $k_0 \ne 0$, then by (12) and (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} ||k\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} &\ge \Delta_{n-1} - \ell\Delta_n \\ &\ge \frac{1}{Cq_n}, \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, ψ_k is exponentially decaying.

Assume $k_0 = 0$, then $|k| = \ell q_n$ with $|\ell| \le 2\frac{\ln q_{n+1}}{q_n\gamma_\lambda(e)}$. Applying the same proof as in the first case, we also have ψ_k is exponentially decaying. □

It is well known that in order to prove Theorem 3.1, it suffices to prove that any polynomially bounded solution (i.e., $u \in \mathcal{P}$) of (1) is exponentially decaying. By the Cayley transform (Lemma 3.2) and Fourier transform, we only need to prove that if the equation (34) has a solution $\hat{c}(x)$ such that $\hat{c}(x)$ is a Fourier transform of a sequence $c_n \in \mathcal{P}$, then c_n is exponentially decaying (or $\hat{c}(x)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{T}$). Applying Lemma 3.4, it suffices to show that $k_\lambda(e) \in \theta - 1/2 + \alpha\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}$. The next two results will establish this fact.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose the equation $e^{-2\pi i\zeta(x)}\hat{c}(x) = e^{-2\pi i\theta}\hat{c}(x+\alpha)$, has a solution $\hat{c}(x)$ such that $\hat{c}(x)$ is a Fourier transform of a sequence $c_n \in \mathcal{P}$, and there exists a sequence $t_k \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $t > 0$ that satisfying the following two conditions:*

(1)$\lim_{k\to\infty}||t_k\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0$*;*

(2)$\sum_{j\ne 0}\sup_k|\frac{1-e^{-2\pi ijt_k\alpha}}{1-e^{-2\pi ij\alpha}}\zeta_j|e^{t|j|} < \infty$.

Then we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}||t_k(k_\lambda(e) - 1/2 - \theta)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0.$$

Proof. Clearly, one has

$$e^{-2\pi i\sum_{j=0}^{t_k-1}\zeta(x+j\alpha)}\hat{c}(x) = e^{-2\pi it_k\theta}\hat{c}(x+t_k\alpha). \tag{37}$$

The first condition implies that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\hat{c}(x+t_k\alpha)=\hat{c}(x)$ in the distributional sense. The second condition implies that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{t_k-1}\zeta(x+j\alpha)-t_k\zeta_0=0,$$

for x in the strip $\{z:|\Im z|\le t/2\}$, uniformly.

Combining with (37), we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}||t_k(\zeta_0-\theta)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}=0.$$

Using (32), we obtain this lemma. □

Proposition 3.6. *If $\gamma_\lambda(e)>\delta(\alpha,\theta)$ and equation (1) has a solution $u\in\mathcal{P}$, then e satisfies*

$$k_\lambda(e)\in\theta+1/2+\alpha\mathbb{Z}+\mathbb{Z}. \tag{38}$$

Proof. Let

$$\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}=\{q_n,2q_n,3q_n,\cdots,\ell_nq_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty},$$

with $\ell_n=\min\{\lfloor\frac{q_n^2}{||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}\rfloor,\lfloor\frac{2q_{n+1}}{q_n}\rfloor\}$, where $\lfloor m\rfloor$ denotes the smallest integer not exceeding m.

By the fact that $\ell_n\le\frac{2q_{n+1}}{q_n}$, one has that t_k satisfies the first condition of Lemma 3.5. Combining with that $\ell_n\le\frac{q_n^2}{||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}$ and using an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4, we have that t_k satisfies the second condition of Lemma 3.5 (see Appendix B.1).

By (31), one has that the equation $e^{-2\pi i\zeta(x)}\hat{c}(x)=e^{-2\pi i\theta}\hat{c}(x+\alpha)$, has a solution $\hat{c}(x)$ such that $\hat{c}(x)$ is a Fourier transform of a sequence $c=(I+iB_1)u\in\mathcal{P}$.

Applying Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}||t_k(k_\lambda(e)-\frac{1}{2}-\theta)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}=0.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}||q_n(k_\lambda(e)-\frac{1}{2}-\theta)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} &\le \frac{1}{\ell_n}\\ &\le \max\{C\frac{||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{q_n^2},C\frac{q_n}{q_{n+1}}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining with (36), we have

$$||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\le\max\{C\frac{||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{q_n^2}+\frac{e^{(\delta+\varepsilon)q_n}}{q_{n+1}},C\frac{q_n}{q_{n+1}}+\frac{e^{(\delta+\varepsilon)q_n}}{q_{n+1}}\}.$$

In particular,

$$||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\le C\frac{q_n}{q_{n+1}}+C\frac{e^{(\delta+\varepsilon)q_n}}{q_{n+1}}.$$

By an argument similar to that in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we obtain that the following equation

$$e^{-2\pi i\tilde{\zeta}(x)}\hat{c}_1(x)=\hat{c}_1(x+\alpha),$$

has an analytic solution $\hat{c}_1(x)$, where $\tilde{\zeta}(x)=\zeta(x)-\zeta_0$ (Appendix B.2).

Let $d(x)=\frac{\hat{c}(x)}{\hat{c}_1(x)}$ (well defined in the distributional sense since $\hat{c}_1(x)$ is analytic). It obeys

$$d(x+\alpha)=e^{-2\pi i(k_\lambda(e)-\frac{1}{2}-\theta)}d(x).$$

This implies that

$$d(x+j_n\alpha) = e^{-2\pi i j_n(k_\lambda(e)-\frac{1}{2}-\theta)}d(x).$$

Thus, for any sequence $j_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} ||j_n\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0$, we must have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} ||j_n(k_\lambda(e) - \frac{1}{2} - \theta)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = 0.$$

This implies $k_\lambda(e) - \frac{1}{2} - \theta = m\alpha \mod \mathbb{Z}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

From above discussion one has that the eigenfunctions corresponding to the eigenvalues in the regime $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ are exponentially decaying. Although the (up to) two points $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) = \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ may or may not be in the point spectrum, we can prove that the corresponding eigenfunctions (if they exist) can not be exponentially decaying.

Proposition 3.7. *If $e \in \sigma_p(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta})$ and the corresponding eigenfunction is exponentially decaying, then we must have $\gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)$.*

Proof. Assume e is an eigenvalue with an exponentially decaying eigenfunction. Then equation (34) must have an analytic solution $\hat{c}(x)$. By ergodicity, this implies $|\hat{c}(x)|$ is constant, so without loss of generality, assume $|\hat{c}(x)| = 1$. Thus $\hat{c}(x)$ defines a map from $\mathbb{T}$ to the circle, and we may assume

$$\hat{c}(x) = e^{-2\pi i(mx+\psi(x))}, \tag{39}$$

where m is the winding number of map $\hat{c}(x)$ and $\psi(x)$ is real analytic on $\mathbb{T}$.

Combining (39) with (34) and comparing the Fourier coefficients, one has

$$k_\lambda(e) = \theta - 1/2 + m\alpha \mod \mathbb{Z} \tag{40}$$

and

$$\psi_k = \frac{\zeta_k}{e^{-2\pi ik\alpha} - 1}, k \neq 0. \tag{41}$$

Assume

$$|\psi_k| \leq Ce^{-2t|k|}.$$

In (41), let $k = q_n$, then combining with (33) one has

$$||q_n k_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq C\frac{e^{(\gamma-t)q_n}}{q_{n+1}},$$

for some $t > 0$.

Using (40), we have

$$||q_n(\theta - 1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq C\frac{e^{(\gamma-t)q_n}}{q_{n+1}}.$$

This implies $\delta(\alpha,\theta) \leq \gamma_\lambda(e) - t < \gamma_\lambda(e)$. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.5

Proof. Set $B_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = \{e : ||t_k(k_\lambda(e) - \theta - 1/2)|| \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty\}$, where the sequence t_k is defined in lemma B.1. Clearly, $B_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ is a proper subset of $A_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$. Combining Lemma 3.5 and Lemma B.1 we obtain part (1).

By Theorem 2.1, part (2) is a combination of Lemma 3.4, Proposition 3.6 and Proposition 3.7.

Part (3) follows immediately from Theorem 2.1 and part (2). □

4. Constancy of the spectrum. Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.7

In this section, we only prove a simple fact that the spectrum of Maryland model $\sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta})$ does not depend on parameter θ which will prove Theorem 1.7. This will aloow us to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Following the discussion of unbounded operators in section VIII [25], it suffices to show that self-adjoint operators $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ are continuous in norm resolvent sense with respect to θ. This can be done using a specific form of the Green function of Maryland model given in (p.349, [11]). Here are the details.

Proof of Theorem 1.7

Let U be the operator $(U\psi)_n = e^{2\pi i n\alpha}\psi_n$. Then we have the following

Lemma 4.1. *(p.349, [11]) Let $G_z(\theta) = (h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} - zI)^{-1}$ and $G_{0,z} = (h^0 - zI)^{-1}$, where h^0 is the free Schrödinger operator (i.e., $h^0 = h_{0,\alpha,\theta}$). Then one has*

$$G_z(\theta) = (I + e^{2\pi i\theta}U)(I + e^{2\pi i\theta}CU)^{-1}G_{0,z-i\lambda} \tag{42}$$

for all $\lambda \cdot \Im z < 0$, where $C = (h^0 - (z + i\lambda)I)G_{0,z-i\lambda}$.

Notice that $||C|| < 1$ for all $\lambda \cdot \Im z < 0$, so that (42) is well defined.

Given two phases θ_1 and θ_2, by ergodicity, there exists a sequence j_k of integers such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} ||\theta_1 + j_k\alpha - \theta_2||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \to 0.$$

Let $B_k = h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta_1+j_k\alpha}$ and $B = h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta_2}$. We have that B_k converges to B in norm resolvent sense. Indeed, if $\Im z < 0$, this is easy to see by (42) (recall that we always assume $\lambda > 0$ in this paper); if $\Im z > 0$, this is also true by the fact that $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta} = h_{-\lambda,-\alpha,-\theta}$.

Thus, according to Theorem VIII.24, [25] on norm resolvent convergence, we have that for any $e \in \sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta_2})$, there exists $e_k \in \sigma(B_k)$ such that $e_k \to e$. Clearly, the spectrum of operator B_k does not depend on k, i.e., $\sigma(B_k) = \sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta_1})$. Thus we must have

$$\sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta_2}) \subseteq \sigma(h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta_1}).$$

This implies the theorem since θ_1 and θ_2 were arbitrary.

Proof of Theorem 1.1:

By Theorem 2.1 and 3.1, we obtain that $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ has purely singular continuous spectrum in the regime $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) < \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$ and only pure point in the regime $\{e : \gamma_\lambda(e) > \delta(\alpha,\theta)\}$. Then Theorem 1.1 follows from Theorem 1.7 and a simple fact that $\sigma_{pp}(h)$ and $\sigma_{sc}(h)$ are closed sets. Notice that we have used the fact that $\sigma_{sc}(h)$ can not have isolated points (corresponding to Fig.2).

Next we show that for any α, there exist phases with Anderson localization.

Corollary 4.2. *Let*

$$S = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : ||q_n(\theta - 1/2)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < 10\frac{q_n}{q_{n+1}} \text{ eventually in } n\},$$

then S is a dense uncountable set and $h_{\lambda,\alpha,\theta}$ satisfies Anderson Localization for every $\theta \in S$. Moreover, the point spectrum is determined by the quantization condition (38).

Proof. Consider the set S_1

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 \quad = \quad & \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \text{ eventually in } n, \text{ there exists some} \\ & 0 \le j \le q_n - 1 \text{ such that } ||\theta - 1/2 + \frac{j}{q_n}||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \frac{10}{q_{n+1}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that S_1 is a dense uncountable set and $S_1 \subseteq S$. This yields that S is also uncountable and dense.

Moreover, for $\theta \in S$, one has $\delta(\alpha, \theta) \leq 0$. Using the fact that $\gamma_\lambda(e) > 0$, Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.6, we obtain the corollary. □

5. Complexified Cocyles

Here we show a simple way to compute $\gamma_\lambda(e)$ using ideas of Avila's global theory.

Denote by $C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, M_2(\mathbb{C}))$ the class of $1-$periodic functions on $\mathbb{R}$, with analytic extension to some strip, $|\Im z| < \delta$, attaining values in complex 2×2 matrices.

Cocycles (α, D) with $D \in C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, M_2(\mathbb{C}))$ are called analytic. For analytic cocycles, the Lyapunov exponent $L(\alpha, D) : \mathbb{T} \times C^\omega(\mathbb{T}, M_2(\mathbb{C})) \to [-\infty, \infty)$ is jointly continuous at every (α, D) with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$ [10, 21, 22]. Given any analytic cocyle (α, D), we consider its holomorphic extension, $(\alpha, D(x + i\epsilon))$ with $|\epsilon| \leq \delta$ for some appropriate $\delta > 0$. $L(\alpha, D_\epsilon)$ is referred to the Lyapunov exponent of the complexified cocyle $(\alpha, D(x + i\epsilon))$, so $L(\alpha, D) = L(\alpha, D_0)$.

The Lyapunov exponent $L(\alpha, D_\epsilon)$ is easily seen to be a convex function of ϵ. Thus we can introduce the acceleration of (α, D),

$$\omega(\alpha, D; \epsilon) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \lim_{h \to 0+} \frac{L(\alpha, D_{\epsilon+h}) - L(\alpha, D_\epsilon)}{h}.$$

It follows from convexity and continuity of the Lyapunov exponent that the acceleration is an upper semi-continuous function in parameter ϵ. The acceleration was first introduced and the above results proved in [1] for analytic $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$-cocycles. It was extended to general case $M_2(\mathbb{C})$ in [22].

The acceleration satisfies

Theorem 5.1. *(Quantization of acceleration,[1, 4, 23]) Consider cocycle (α, D) with $\det D(x)$ is bounded away from zero on the strip $\mathbb{T}_\delta = \{z : |\Im z| < \delta\}$, then $\omega(\alpha, D; \epsilon) \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$.*

Moreover, $\omega(\alpha, D; \epsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{C})$-cocycles [1, 4].

After the above preparation, we can compute the Lyapunove exponent of the Maryland model.

Recall that the Maryland cocycle (α, A) is given by

$$A(x) = \begin{pmatrix} e - \lambda \tan \pi x & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Lemma 5.2. *$L(\alpha, A_\epsilon)$ is a continuous function with respect to parameter ϵ.*

Proof. Recall that by (8), $D(x) = \cos \pi x A(x)$ is an analytic cocycle, thus $L(\alpha, D_\epsilon)$ is continuous in ϵ.

Set $I_\epsilon = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \ln |\cos \pi(x + i\epsilon)| dx$. We have

$$L(\alpha, A_\epsilon) = L(\alpha, D_\epsilon) - I_\epsilon.$$

Applying Jensen's formula yields ([21] or [22])

$$I_\epsilon = \pi|\epsilon| - \ln 2, \text{ for all } \epsilon. \tag{43}$$

Since (43) explicitly implies the continuity of I_ϵ in ϵ, the continuity of $L(\alpha, A_\epsilon)$ follows. □

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\gamma_\lambda(e) = L(\alpha, A)$, then $\gamma_\lambda(e) > 0$ and the following equation holds,*

$$4 \cosh \gamma_\lambda(e) = \sqrt{(2 + e)^2 + \lambda^2} + \sqrt{(2 - e)^2 + \lambda^2}. \tag{44}$$

Proof. First, uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{T}$, one has

$$A(x + i\epsilon) = A_\infty + o(1),$$

as $\epsilon \to +\infty$, where

$$A_\infty = \begin{pmatrix} e - i\lambda & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By continuity of the LE,

$$L(\alpha, A_\epsilon) = L(\alpha, A_\infty) + o(1),$$

as $\epsilon \to +\infty$.

The quantization of acceleration yields

$$L(\alpha, A_\epsilon) = L(\alpha, A_\infty), \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0 \text{ sufficiently large.}$$

In addition the convexity, continuity and symmetry of $L(\alpha, A_\epsilon)$ with respected to ϵ, gives

$$L(\alpha, A_\epsilon) = L(\alpha, A_\infty), \text{ for all } \epsilon.$$

Note that symmetry means $L(\alpha, A_\epsilon) = L(\alpha, A_{-\epsilon})$.

This implies

$$\gamma_\lambda(e) = L(\alpha, A_\infty).$$

Then Theorem 5.3 follows from solving for the eigenvalue of A_∞ (a constant matrix) directly. □

Finally, we note that for general Schrödinger operators

$$(Hu)_n = u_{n+1} + u_{n-1} + v(\theta + n\alpha)u_n,$$

where $v : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is real analytic, Avila gives a complete description of spectrum under the condition of positive LE.

Theorem 5.4. *([1]) For real analytic v, if LE $L(\alpha, B_e) > 0$, then $e \in spec(H)$ if and only if $\omega(\alpha, B_e; 0) > 0$, where*

$$B_e(x) = \begin{pmatrix} e - v(x) & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For the Maryland model, however, we have $\gamma_\lambda(e) > 0, \text{spec}(h) = (-\infty, +\infty)$; yet $\omega(\alpha, A_e; 0) = 0$ for all e. This is similar to the phenomenon observed for the extended Harper's model for certain parameters (see Sec. 7 in [22]). Thus it gives another counterexample to Theorem 5.4 in the singular case.

Appendix A.

Lemma A.1. *The following estimate holds*

$$||A^{-1}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)A^{-1}(\theta + \alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) \cdots A^{-1}(\theta + (j_0 - 1)\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)|| \le Ce^{\tilde{q}_k(\gamma_\lambda(e)+\varepsilon)}.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that

$$||A_{j_0}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)|| \le Ce^{\tilde{q}_k(\gamma_\lambda(e)+\varepsilon)}.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{j_0}(\theta - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) &= \prod_{j_0-1}^{j=0} A(\theta + j\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha) \\ &= \prod_{j_0-1}^{j=0} \frac{D(\theta + j\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)}{\cos\pi(\theta + j\alpha - \tilde{q}_k\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

By (11), one has

$$\prod_{j_0-1}^{j=0} D(\theta+j\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha) \le Ce^{(L+\varepsilon)j_0}. \tag{45}$$

By (23),

$$|\cos\pi(\theta+j\alpha)| \ge \frac{1}{C\tilde{q}_k} \text{ for all } j \ne j_0.$$

Combing with (16), we have

$$|\cos\pi(\theta+j\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)| \ge \frac{1}{C\tilde{q}_k} \text{ for all } j \ne j_0. \tag{46}$$

If $|\cos\pi(\theta+j_0\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)|$ is the smallest one of $|\cos\pi(\theta+j\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)|$, $j=0,1,\cdots,\tilde{q}_k-1$, applying Lemma 2.2, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{j=0}^{j_0-1}|\cos\pi(\theta+j\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)| &\ge \prod_{j=0,j\ne j_0}^{\tilde{q}_k-1}|\cos\pi(\theta+j\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)| \\ &\ge \frac{e^{(-\ln 2-\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k}}{C\tilde{q}_k}. \qquad (47)\end{aligned}$$

If for some $j'\ne j_0$, $|\cos\pi(\theta+j'\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)|$ is the smallest one of $|\cos\pi(\theta+j\alpha-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)|$, $j=0,1,\cdots,\tilde{q}_k-1$, by Lemma 2.2 and (46), (47) also holds.

Putting (45) and (47) together,

$$\begin{aligned}||A_{j_0}(\theta-\tilde{q}_k\alpha)|| &\le Ce^{(L+\varepsilon)j_0}\tilde{q}_k e^{(\ln 2+\varepsilon)\tilde{q}_k} \\ &\le Ce^{\tilde{q}_k(\gamma_\lambda(e)+2\varepsilon)}.\end{aligned}$$

This yields Lemma A.1.

□

Appendix B.

Lemma B.1. *Let*

$$\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}=\{q_n,2q_n,3q_n,\cdots,\ell_nq_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty},$$

with $\ell_n=\min\{\lfloor\frac{q_n^2}{||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}\rfloor,\lfloor\frac{2q_{n+1}}{q_n}\rfloor\}$, *then for some* $t>0$, *we have*

$$\sum_{j\ne0}\sup_k|\frac{1-e^{-2\pi ijt_k\alpha}}{1-e^{-2\pi ij\alpha}}\zeta_j|e^{t|j|}<\infty. \tag{48}$$

Proof. Fix some $t_k=\ell q_n$ with $\ell\le\frac{q_n^2}{||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}$ and $\ell\le\frac{2q_{n+1}}{q_n}$.

If $|j|=q_{n'}$ with $n'\le n-1$, by (33) one has

$$\begin{aligned}|\frac{1-e^{-2\pi ijt_k\alpha}}{1-e^{-2\pi ij\alpha}}\zeta_j| &\le C|j|\ell\frac{||q_n\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{||q_{n'}\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}|\zeta_j| \\ &\le C|j|\frac{q_{n+1}}{q_n}\frac{q_{n'+1}}{q_{n+1}}|\zeta_j| \\ &\le C|j\zeta_j|\le Ce^{-\frac{\gamma_\lambda(e)}{2}|j|}.\end{aligned}$$

If $|j|=q_n$, by (33) again, one has

$$|\zeta_j|\le C||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)|q_n|}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}|\frac{1-e^{-2\pi ijt_k\alpha}}{1-e^{-2\pi ij\alpha}}\zeta_j| &\leq C\frac{t_k||j\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{||j\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}|\zeta_j|\\ &\leq C\frac{q_n^3}{||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)|q_n|}\\ &\leq Ce^{-\frac{\gamma_\lambda(e)}{2}|j|}.\end{aligned}$$

If $|j|=q_{n'}$ with $n'\geq n+1$, also by (33) one has

$$\begin{aligned}|\frac{1-e^{-2\pi ijt_k\alpha}}{1-e^{-2\pi ij\alpha}}\zeta_j| &\leq C\frac{t_k||j\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{||j\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}|\zeta_j|\\ &\leq Cq_{n+1}e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)q_{n'}}\\ &\leq Ce^{-\frac{\gamma_\lambda(e)}{2}|j|}.\end{aligned}$$

If $q_{n'-1}<|j|<q_{n'}$ for some $n'\in\mathbb{N}^+$, by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4 , we also have

$$\begin{aligned}|\frac{1-e^{-2\pi ijt_k\alpha}}{1-e^{-2\pi ij\alpha}}\zeta_j| &\leq |\frac{C\zeta_j}{1-e^{-2\pi ij\alpha}}|\\ &\leq Ce^{-\frac{\gamma_\lambda(e)}{2}|j|}.\end{aligned}$$

The estimate (48) is easy to obtain from the above cases.

□

Lemma B.2. *Suppose for n large enough, the following holds,*

$$||q_nk_\lambda(e)||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}\leq C\frac{q_n}{q_{n+1}}+C\frac{e^{(\delta+\varepsilon)q_n}}{q_{n+1}}.$$

Let $\tilde{\zeta}(x)=\zeta(x)-\zeta_0$. Then equation

$$e^{-2\pi i\tilde{\zeta}(x)}\hat{c}_1(x)=\hat{c}_1(x+\alpha) \tag{49}$$

has an analytic solution.

Proof. The proof of this lemma is similar to that of Lemma 3.4. We only show some key steps. We will prove that equation (49) has an analytic solution of the form $\hat{c_1}(x)=e^{-2\pi i\psi(x)}$, where $\psi(x)$ is real analytic on $\mathbb{T}$. Substituting $\hat{c}(x)=e^{-2\pi i\psi(x)}$ into (49) and comparing the Fourier coefficients, one has

$$\psi_k=\frac{\zeta_k}{e^{-2\pi ik\alpha}-1}, k\neq 0.$$

In order to prove this lemma, we only need to prove that ψ_k is exponentially small.

If $|k|=q_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi_k| &\leq C\frac{e^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)q_n}||q_nk_\gamma(e))||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}{||q_n\alpha||_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}}\\ &\leq Ce^{-(\gamma_\lambda(e)-\delta-\varepsilon)q_n}+Ce^{-\gamma_\lambda(e)q_n}q_n.\end{aligned}$$

Thus ψ_k is exponentially decaying.

The proofs of the other cases are the same as in the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by NSF DMS-1401204. This work was done when Wencai Liu visited University of California, Irvine in 2014. He would like to thank Xiaoping Yuan (Professor at Fudan University) for supporting him partly. SJ would like to thank Mira Shamis for reminding her of the open problems on the Maryland model and the organizers of Kent State Informal Analysis Seminar in March 2014, during which this research was started.

References

[1] Avila, A. Global theory of one-frequency Schrödinger operators. *Acta Math.* **215** (2015), no. 1, 1–54.
[2] Avila, A.; Jitomirskaya, S. The Ten Martini Problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **170** (2009), no. 1, 303–342.
[3] Avila, A.; Jitomirskaya, S. Almost localization and almost reducibility. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **12** (2010), no. 1, 93–131.
[4] Avila, A.; Jitomirskaya, S.; Sadel, C. Complex one-frequency cocycles. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **16** (2014), no. 9, 1915–1935.
[5] Avila, A.; Krikorian, R. Monotonic cocycles. *Invent. Math.* **202** (2015), no. 1, 271–331.
[6] Avila, A.; You, J.; Zhou, Q. Sharp phase transitions for the almost Mathieu operator. http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.03124, 2015.
[7] Avron, J.; Simon, B. Almost periodic Schrödinger operators. II. The integrated density of states. *Duke Math. J.* **50** (1983), no. 1, 369–391.
[8] Berry, M. V. Incommensurability in an exactly-soluble quantal and classical model for a kicked rotator. *Phys. D* **10** (1984), no. 3, 369–378.
[9] Bllissard, J.; Lima, R.; Scoppola, E. Localization in v-dimensional incommensurate structures. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **88** (1983), no. 4, 465–477.
[10] Bourgain, J.; Jitomirskaya, S. Continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for quasiperiodic operators with analytic potential. Dedicated to David Ruelle and Yasha Sinai on the occasion of their 65th birthdays. *J. Statist. Phys.* **108** (2002), no. 5-6, 1203–1218.
[11] Carmona, R.; Lacroix, J. *Spectral theory of random Schrödinger operators. Probability and its Applications*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1990.
[12] Cycon, H. L.; Froese, R. G.; Kirsch, W.; Simon, B. *Schrödinger operators with application to quantum mechanics and global geometry.* Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer Study Edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
[13] Fedotov, A.; Sandomirskiy, F. An exact renormalization formula for the Maryland model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **334** (2015), no. 2, 1083–1099.
[14] Figotin, A. L.; Pastur, L. A. An exactly solvable model of a multidimensional incommensurate structure. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **95** (1984), no. 4, 401–425.
[15] Fishman, S. Anderson localization and quantum chaos maps. Scholarpedia, 5:9816, 2010.
[16] Ganeshan, S.; Kechedzhi, K.; Das Sarma, S. Critical integer quantum hall topology and the integrable maryland model as a topological quantum critical point. *Phys. Rev. B* **90**(2014), no. 4, 041405.
[17] Gordon, A. The point spectrum of the one-dimensional Schrödinger operator. *(Russian) Uspehi Mat. Nauk* **31** (1976), no. 4(190), 257–258.
[18] Gordon, A. Imperfectly grown periodic medium: absence of localized states. *J. Spectr. Theory* **5** (2015), no. 2, 279–294.
[19] Grempel, D.; Fishman, S.; Prange, R. Localization in an incommensurate potential: An exactly solvable model. *Physical Review Letters* **49**(1982), no. 11, 833.
[20] Jakšić, V.; Molchano, S. On the spectrum of the surface Maryland model. *Lett. Math. Phys.* **45** (1998), no. 3, 189–193.
[21] Jitomirskaya, S.; Koslover, D. A.; Schulteis, M. S. Localization for a family of one-dimensional quasiperiodic operators of magnetic origin. *Ann. Henri Poincaré* **6** (2005), no. 1, 103–124.
[22] Jitomirskaya, S.; Marx, C. A. Analytic quasi-perodic cocycles with singularities and the Lyapunov exponent of extended Harper's model. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **316** (2012), no. 1, 237–267.
[23] Jitomirskaya, S.; Marx, C. A. Erratum to: Analytic quasi-perodic cocycles with singularities and the Lyapunov exponent of extended Harper's model [MR2989459]. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **317** (2013), no. 1, 269–271.
[24] Pastur, L.; Figotin, A. *Spectra of random and almost-periodic operators*. Springer Berlin etc., 1992.
[25] Reed, M.; Simon. B. *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics: Vol.1.: Functional Analysis*. Academic press, 1972.

[26] Simon, B. Almost periodic Schrödinger operators. IV. The Maryland model. *Ann. Physics* **159** (1985), no. 1, 157–183.
[27] Simon, B.; Spencer, T. Trace class perturbations and the absence of absolutely continuous spectra. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **125** (1989), no. 1, 113–125.

(Svetlana Jitomirskaya) Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine, California 92697-3875, USA
E-mail address: szhitomi@math.uci.edu

(Wencai Liu) School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, P. R. China
E-mail address: liuwencai1226@gmail.com

Current address: Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine, California 92697-3875, USA